

---

# Kluwer Patent Blog

## Patent Case: Tomra v. Kiremko, The Netherlands

Bart van Wezenbeek (Hoffmann Eitle) · Saturday, December 8th, 2018

The Court confirmed that a District court, not specialised in patent matters, does have relative jurisdiction to decide a motion to produce exhibits for determining patent infringement. In order to positively decide a motion to produce exhibits, (threat of) infringement should be made plausible, but the threshold for plausibility is relatively low. Further, technical details of products that are on the market may still be considered to be trade secrets.

Case number: NL 17.11739

Case date: 02 November 2018

Court: District Court of Midden-Nederland

A full summary of this case has been published on [Kluwer IP Law](#).

---

*To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Patent Blog, please [subscribe here](#).*

## Kluwer IP Law

The **2022 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 79% of lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year. With Kluwer IP Law you can navigate the increasingly global practice of IP law with specialized, local and cross-border information and tools from every preferred location. Are you, as an IP professional, ready for the future?

Learn how **Kluwer IP Law** can support you.

---

79% of the lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year.

**Drive change with Kluwer IP Law.**

The master resource for Intellectual Property rights and registration.



2022 SURVEY REPORT  
The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer  
Leading change



This entry was posted on Saturday, December 8th, 2018 at 5:28 pm and is filed under [Case Law](#), [Infringement](#), [Netherlands](#), [Plausibility](#), [Trade secrets](#)

You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. Both comments and pings are currently closed.